REMARKS

Receipt of the Office Action of January 26, 2010 is gratefully acknowledged.

Claims 7 - 13 have been examined and rejected as follows: claims 7 - 10 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph as indefinite; claim 8 under 35 USC 102(b) by Behrens et al; claims 7, 11 and 13 under 35 USC 103(a) by Behrens et al in view of Mancini et al; and claims 9, 10 and 12 under 35 USC 103(a) by Behrens et al in view of Mancini et al and Barros De Almeida.

In reply, claim 7 has been amended by including that "a calibration of the sensor is possible with the help of the calibration unit" and the further method step of "connecting the storage medium with the computer unit via an interface that serves as an Explosion-barrier providing a galvanic separation, which occurs either optically, capacitively or inductively". This further recitation related to the Explosion-barrier has been suggested by the Examiner and should therefore overcome the rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

Behrens et al does not disclose a calibration unit, wherein a calibration of the sensor is possible with the help of the calibration unit. The processor mentioned in col. 7, lines 40-41 is arranged within an I/O-module according to Fig. 5 of the Behrens et al reference. This processor (69) may perform processing according to an internal stored program and may transmit relevant data from the input through isolator 60 onto data lines 56 and to the processor 16' (col. 7, lines 37-41). Behrens et al does not mention that with the help of the processor 69 a calibration of the sensor is possible. Behrens et al does not mention calibration at all.

Claim 14 includes a step of "calibrating the sensor with the help of the calibration unit" and a further step of "saving calibration data of the sensor to a portable storage medium which is separable from the calibration unit" and a final step of "transferring the calibration data to the computer unit via a standard interface provided at the computer unit". Behrens et al does not mention any of these steps.

Mancini et al and Barros De Almeida do not disclose any methods involving calibrating a sensor and transferring calibration data from a sensor to a computer unit either.

Furthermore, please note that Mancini et al does not disclose saving measurement data (or calibration data, cf. claim 14) to a portable storage medium, which is separable from the calibration unit. Col. 3, lines 34-35 to which the Examiner refers disclose that the core computer described in Mancini et al can be separated from an IS-enclosure. The IS-enclosure, however, is not a calibration unit, which is used for calibrating a sensor. Mancini et al does not disclose separating or connecting the portable storage medium to a calibration unit as defined in claim 7 or 14.

Claim 8 has been amended by the feature, that "a calibration of the sensor is possible with the help of the calibration unit", that the Explosion-barrier provides a galvanic separation, which occurs either optically, capacitively or inductively" (as suggested by the Examiner) and by features of former claims 9 and 10, that the standard interface at the computer unit is a USB interface and that data transfer between the sensor and the calibration unit occurs with a proprietary protocol.

As such claim 8 is believed to overcome the indefiniteness rejection and to better define over the art of record.

New independent claim 17 includes steps of "calibrating the sensor with the help of the calibration unit", transferring calibration data from the calibration unit to an interface, which is embodied as an Explosion barrier" and "transferring the calibration data from the interface to the computer unit via a standard interface provided at the computer unit, wherein the computer provides a history of the sensor using the calibration data transferred from the portable storage medium".

The Behrens et al reference does not disclose a calibration unit, wherein a calibration of the sensor is possible with the help of the calibration unit, as pointed out above. Neither does Barros de Almeida or Mancini et al. Furthermore, neither Behrens et al, Mancini et al or Barros de Almeida disclose any methods involving calibrating a sensor, transferring calibration data from a sensor to a computer unit or providing a history of the sensor using calibration data transferred from the portable storing medium.

With respect to claim 11, the Examiner refers to the Behrens et al reference and combines it with the Mancini et al reference. He argues, that Mancini et al discloses transferring data to a plug in module of the computer unit (= computer core module 105) with the plug-in module comprising an explosion barrier. However, the computer core module described in the Mancini et al reference as such does not comprise an Explosion-barrier. In fact, only the combination of the computer core module 105 and the enclosure 100 is intrinsically safe (cf. col. 5, lines 35-38 and col. 3, lines18-23). Consequently, there are only two possibilities:

- either the computer core module disclosed by Mancini et al corresponds to the plug-in module as defined in claim 11: in this case, it does not comprise an Explosion-barrier (since only a combination of the core module and the enclosure realizes the explosion-barrier); or

- the combination of the computer core module and the enclosure corresponds to the plug-in module defined in claim 11: in this case, the plug-in module would not be a plug-in module of the computer unit, since only the computer core module 105 alone can be inserted into the computer for transferring data (col. 3, lines 35-39 and col.3, lines 46-50).

Claim 13 includes the features, that "in the computer unit different sensors and measuring points are managed, and wherein a graphic illustration of the history of the sensor is provided at the computer unit". These features are not known from any of the references cited in the Office Action.

Furthermore, please note with respect to dependent claim 12, that Barros de Almeida does not disclose a PCMCIA plug-in card comprising an Explosion-barrier, providing a galvanic separation, which occurs either optically, capacitively or inductively. Barros de Almeida simply teaches, that a PCMCIA connection is an interface to connect a control device to a Foundation Fieldbus network or a Profibus network (col. 1, line 64- col. 2, line 2). However, even a combination of Barros de Almeida, Mancini et al and Behrens et al cannot teach all the features of claim 11 in combination with claim 12, since none of these documents discloses a PCMCIA plug-in card comprising an Explosion-barrier.

In view of the foregoing, reexamination is respectfully requested and claims 7, 8, and 10 - 14 found allowable along with new claims 15 - 19.

Respectfully submitted,
BACON & THOMAS, PLLC

Date: June 28, 2010

Felix J. D'Ambrosio
Registration No: 25,721

Customer Number *23364*
BACON & THOMAS
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
Phone: (703) 683-0500
S:\Producer\fjd\CLIENTS\Endress+Hauser Holding GmbH\WITT3006-CD0192\June 28, 2010 RESPONSE.wpd